1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

Speaker Madigan: "We will now call to order the Third Special Session. And again, for purposes of an Attendance Roll Call, is there leave to use the Attendance Roll Call from the First Special Session? Leave is granted. Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "State your inquiry."

Speaker, it's my understanding Hoffman: "Yes, Mr. Proclamation for the Third Special Session is very specific from the Governor. Pursuant to Article IV, Section 5(b) of the Illinois Constitution, the Governor may convene the General Assembly or the Senate alone in Special Session by Proclamation stating the purpose of the Session. addition, it is my understanding that there have been significant court rulings and numerous court rulings, including Herzberger v. Kelly, where the Supreme Court of Illinois stated that the Governor possesses the authority to convene the General Assembly in Special Session at any time when and in the exercise of his official discretion he deems the occasion warrants such action. In addition, there are statutory authority, specifically 25 ILCS indicating that the Governor, when calling a Special Session, shall file the Proclamation calling the Session with the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State will take whatever reasonable steps necessary to notify the Members of the General Assembly of the date and time of the Special Session. In addition, our House Rules recognize, under House Rule 28(b), that pursuant to the Constitution of the State of Illinois, Special Session days and times can be called. I believe that the precedent is very clear

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

that the Governor, under his Constitutional authority as well as under the statutory authority, as well as judicial cases and precedent and the House Rules, has the authority to specifically indicate the date and the time of the Special Session. And I know you, as Speaker, over the years have indicated that and have acceded to the Constitutional authority of the Governor. And the calling of the Third Special not at 2:00, but now is in direct... is directly contrary to the Constitutional authority, the statutory authority, the House Rules, and judicial precedent. And I don't believe, this is me personally talking, outside of the inquiry to the parliamentarian as to the ability to do this, that one person should be able to decide when and if the Constitution of the State of Illinois should simply be thrown out the window and us not follow it."

Speaker Madigan: "I'm gonna ask the parliamentarian and counsel and to the Speaker to respond to the Gentleman's inquiry or objection, whatever it is. But before I do that... fine, very good. I wanna note for the record that the Governor's Proclamation for the Second Special Session provided that that Special Session would be convened at 2 p.m. yesterday. That Special Session actually convened at 4:18 p.m., a difference of over two (2) hours from the Proclamation, and there was no similar objection and inquiry noted yesterday. But, I'll ask the parliamentarian and counsel to the Speaker to address the question. David Ellis."

Parliamentarian Ellis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Hoffman, on behalf of the Speaker and in response to your inquiry, you are correct that the Illinois Constitution

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

allows the Governor to call a Special Session and that Special Sessions shall be limited to the purpose of the Proclamation, that's Article IV, Section 5. However, Article IV, Section 5, does not give authority to the Governor to require, to require a specific date and time. That does not appear in the Constitution and, therefore, as a corollary, there is no requirement that the General Assembly meet at any particular date or time. To the contrary, the Constitution in Article IV, Section 6(d), gives the Const... gives the House and the individually, each chamber of the General Assembly, authority to determine their own rules of proceedings, included in the ability to determine its own rules of proceedings is determined when and where to meet. As for the statutory provision, the Special Session Act covers two (2) scenarios. One is when the House and the Senate together issue a joint Proclamation calling for a Special Session. In that instance, the Special Session Act does require that the date and time be put in the joint Proclamation issued by the Speaker and the President of the Senate. Notably, in the provision of the Special Session Act related to the Governor, there is no such requirement. There may be a contemplation that the Governor may choose to put a date and time in, but there is no mandate. And in any event, that statutory mandate would yield to constitutional prerogative of the House to determine its own rules. Therefore, it's the ruling of the Chair that the convening of this Third Special Session at this time is constitutional and proper."

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Just for the record, Mr. Speaker, I'm not... You're the Speaker, you guys are gonna rule the way you want. I just... for the record, I have an obligation to point out way back in 1871, and I think the only person alive at that time was Representative McCarthy, but way back in 1871 the House... there was a similar case and it was very specific in the Journal of the House, this goes back to then, a date and time was called and people showed up at the date and time the Governor asked. In addition to that, there have been several instances... and I know of no instance in the history of the State of Illinois... and specifically, I would like to cite the case of Herzberger v. Kelly, a 1937 Supreme Court case, that indicated that the Governor possesses the authority to convene the General Assembly in Special Session at any time when in the exercise of his official discretion he deems the occasion warrants such action. So for the record, I am just... I would like to read that into record, make that point. You're gonna do what you want. That's all I got."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman, again, for the record, I'd like the counsel, Mr. Ellis, who's read that case that you were citing, speak to the point you just made. Mr. Ellis."

Parliamentarian Ellis: "Representative Hoffman, the Herzberger case was a case in which one Special Session had already been called and the Governor then called a Second Special Session. It was actually at that time the Fourth Special Session. And the issue before the Supreme Court in Herzberger was whether a law passed out of that Fourth

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

Special Session was valid when the General Assembly had already been in Special Session, previously. The court ruled that the Governor has the authority to... to call a Special Session anytime he deemed an emergency situation to exist, which was the governing provision under that Constitution, which is not the current Constitution. And the Herzberger case simply gave the Governor the authority to call Special Sessions. There was nothing in that decision that remotely, remotely suggested that the General Assembly could be required, that could be dictated to meet at a given date and time."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Just for the... the purposes of my colleagues and Members of the General Assembly, for the purposes of our families, I understand. My daughter's home from college, I wanna see her. We do have work to do. I don't believe us doing this today will end this issue at 10:00 this morning. So, you may not like me for saying this, but think about sticking around."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think anybody who has been here for more than 5 years knows that I often take umbrage at the sometimes creative interpretation of House Rules and Constitutional Rule of the parliamentarian of the House. However, I rise today with a copy of the Constitution, outlined the applicable subject matter, and Mr. Ellis is absolutely correct. Now, I'm no constitutional scholar by any means and I'm not an attorney. But the language is very clear. 'The Governor may convene the

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

General Assembly or the Senate alone in Special Session by a Proclamation stating the purpose of the Session and only business encompassed by such purpose together with...' blah, blah, blah. Now, this is taken directly from the Illinois Constitution, Article IV. It does... it says absolutely nothing about setting the time. And if I might, Mr. Speaker, and in all due respect to Representative Hoffman, who've I've known for about 20 years and consider him a friend and we shared a mutual friend who's no longer with us, and in all due respect to the Governor ... I respect the Office of the Governor. He's elected statewide. Now, not. And in all due respect of the Speaker, the longest serving Speaker in the history of the Illinois House and I believe the senior Member of the Illinois House. I respect all of those Gentlemen and I have said publicly on this floor many times, I respect the process that we are involved in. Now I don't take myself very seriously, but I take the process in which we are involved and which we have been privileged by standing for election to serve in this Body. But I... I would be remiss if I didn't let some of my feelings be known publicly. First of all, what difference does it make whether we meet to the do the business that we're here to do at 10:00 or at 2:00 or at 4:00? I sound like an ad for Dr. Pepper, 10, 2, and 4. Come to think of it, I wouldn't mind a Dr. Pepper about now. I... I think, in all due respect, the Legislative Branch has a right to be respected as a coequal partner of the Executive Branch and the Judicial Branch. That's basically what I learned in a constitutional course that I took many, many years ago in

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

college. I have... and I'm at an age now ... I'm much older than Representative Hoffman. I'm at an age now where you begin to realize that time lost with family is time you may never regain, and it's extremely important. I have two wonderful children, six (6) delightful grandchildren, and every day I'm not allowed to be with them is a day, again, that I will never be able to recapture. But I... I would be remiss if I didn't say, for heaven's sakes, what is going on with this process? Do we really want to try and precipitate a constitutional crisis over what time we meet? That isn't a constitutional crisis. And I think, as Mr. Ellis has already pointed out, the Constitution doesn't even mention that fact. But why would we want to do this? It doesn't make any difference whether we meet at 10, 2, 4, 6. We're here. We can do the business of the people. I... again, and I... I'm not ... I don't want to insult anybody and I hope my remarks aren't intended... or taken or twisted in that context. But, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these arguments and press availabilities are degenerating into a childish schoolyard tantrum. I'm president of the student council. We're not going to play in the sandbox today. No, I'm president of the student advisory committee and we are going to play in the sandbox today. No, you're not. Yes, we are. Well, you can play in the sandbox, but only at 2:00. We are in deep Special Session trying to do the work of the people and I think you will hear shortly, I'm not privy to all of the goings on, but a witness that we need to hear from has been told evidently that he cannot appear until 2:00. Now, come on. Everybody, let's just take a step back.

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

Let's act like grownups. I don't think yesterday was a three-ring circus. I don't think yesterday was designed to embarrass the Governor or anyone else. I would ask the Members of the House, are you willing, are you ready, will sponsor a tax increase... multibillion dollar tax increase to fund the programs that the Governor wants to do? I don't fault the Governor for what he wants to do. They are noble objectives. And I don't stand in opposition to... to universal health care. And I'm not a far right-wing Republican, whatever that is. I think it's a pejorative term, I'm not sure. And I don't think the Speaker is either. And I don't think we gain anything by calling the Speaker of the House a right-wing Republican or anything else that he might be called. Now, I do think... in all fairness, we made a trade earlier. You picked up a utility outfielder, Representative Froehlich. And in return, I think... and I extend this invitation to the Speaker. He is more than welcome to join us on our side of the aisle. Then he can be the designated hitter. But when all is said and done, for heaven's sake, the time we meet is going to precipitate a constitutional crisis and calling the Speaker a far right wing Republican adds anything to the process? I respect the man on the second floor. I served with him in this Body. I don't dislike the man. He's a personable fellow. I don't get a chance to talk to him very often, but I... I have introduced him when he came to Danville some years ago and appeared at a senior center. One of his staff asked if I would introduce him, as I know most of those seniors there because I am one. I was proud to introduce

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

him. I didn't hide. I didn't run away. I didn't say, 'Well, Governor, I would love to introduce you but only at 2:00.' So, I introduced him and he had a good visit and he did very well. He's very good on the stump, we all know that. Let's just tone down the rhetoric. I think the concept of the meeting of whole is a good concept, and we used to do more of it than we do now. I came here, the Appropriations Committee some 20 years ago actually did the heavy lifting on a budget. And if you could get your budget Bills out of the Appropriation Committee... yes, they were often massaged or... or amended or changed somewhat in the meeting of the budgeteers, but the Members of this chamber were empowered to draft a budget. That has changed over the years and maybe it will go back. But I, for one, have had enough of the name calling, of the cute little terms that add nothing to the process, that keeps all us from our families, that keeps all of us from the duties... you know, the duties of my district office don't stop when I'm down here. People want to meet with me, I have things I have to do that's part of the job. Now let's just start meeting as adults, lower the tone of the rhetoric. We should respect each other for our respective abilities. And I certainly respect the Speaker, the President of the Senate, the House Republican Leader, obviously, and the Senate Republican Leader, and I respect all of you. And I think we're capable of meeting as a Committee of the Whole and come up with a budget. But, Mr. Governor, the challenge is for you to get out your dictionary today, look up the word 'compromise', pronounce it, spell it, and learn to define it. You can't get

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

everything you want in this process. Thus it has always been, thus it always will be. I must have seven (7) Bills on the discharge Calendar, Bills that I wanted. I didn't get them. I'll try again next year. It's time to put the elementary school games behind us. It's time to remember that we have differences, real differences. We can't start new programs if we aren't willing to raise taxes to support them. And I think time and time again... from what we've read and heard, neither chamber is ready to pass any massive tax or borrowing increase. Now, given that fact, let's do the best we can with the resources that we have. And I will resist strongly any further attempt by the Governor's Office to somehow insinuate that Republicans are less than second-class citizens, that somehow we are all right-wing whatever. We have a diverse caucus. We helped you pass an emergency budget that the Governor signed. We have put forth a capital infrastructure plan. We have put forth a budget that lives within our means and does not raise taxes. The Speaker has passed a budget from this chamber with a modest tax increase that tries to meet core government services. Now, I... I am not prepared to stay here all summer and miss family events that I may never again have the chance to participate in. I'm disappointed and more than a little discouraged, and when I read the today's newspaper even a little disgusted with the tone of the rhetoric that was said yesterday. It will take all of us together now to get out of this mess. Governor, we need your help and you need our help. And you're not going to get that help and you can't expect that help when you

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

insult us and when you try to generate a... I don't even know should use... some kind of constitutional word I confrontation over what time we meet. For heaven's sakes, it's time to put away such childish behavior. I wouldn't tolerate this out of my children when they were young. What, was I gonna set a rule? My son could play with the teddy bear until noon and my daughter could play with the teddy bear until 2. You don't handle your family this way. You don't handle the business of the State of Illinois this way. And we are putting people in the State of Illinois at risk. School districts need to plan now. What will their budgets be? Social service agencies are trying determine, do we lay off people, do we stop taking new case? We don't know what our money is going to be. How do you expect us to operate next year? We can't operate and will not operate any longer on 30-day budgets. It's the 7th of July, 7-7-7. Let's make that a lucky day. Let's stop the rhetoric, stop the childish games. Let's do the best we can with the resources we have, pass a budget so that schools can plan for the next year. Social services agencies that treat our most vulnerable citizens in the State Illinois, let them plan. Let them be able to know how many they will be able to serve, whether they will meet payroll. Enough is enough. 7-7-7 should be a new day, perhaps a lucky day. Let's stop all this bickering childishness. Let us be on our way. And I plan to follow the lead of the Speaker of the House because of the office that he holds. And I ready... I'm ready to stand to work with him, with any of you, with Leader Cross. We can and we will

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

put together the best budget we can given the resources that we have. Now, enough of this childish behavior. Let's get to work and act like the adults we're supposed to be."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I applaud the comments of Mr. Black. I hardly know where to begin, but I'll find a spot to do so. The... the letter... the letter that was sent to the Speaker creating... or attempting to create a constitutional crisis is an insult to all of us. It's an insult to the process of the General Assembly. More important, an insult to the process of the House of Representatives. The Senate apparently does not have these problems with the Governor even though we've sat Committee of the Whole after Committee of the Whole after Committee of the Whole working while the Senate does whatever they do over there. We're doing some work over there. We've gotten some good work done over the last several days. The Governor can call it was it wishes. think we had an engaged an Body. It's too bad all of our Members weren't here. I think we should have some comments for them when they return. But we've gotten some good work done. We've been engaged. We've talked about these issues. We've asked our questions. The same Governor who would force a constitutional crisis has yet to answer my several pages of questions that I told Mr. Filan the other day that would be asked, questions that were supposed to have been answered yesterday before we voted on that Bill. It's now 24 hours later, we still don't have the answers to the questions. I would still like them by the way, Mr. Governor and Mr.

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

Filan. I think I'm entitled to 'em. And so, also are the Members of this House entitled to the answers to those questions. This constitutional crisis that the Governor wants to create is of his own making. He's done it for his own purposes. They certainly aren't done for any purposes of advancing the public policy of the State of Illinois. They certainly aren't done for the purpose of advancing the work we're doing in this House to try to create a budget and the work we have done to try to create a budget. In fact, it was cowardly. The Governor received his letter from the Speaker yesterday saying we were going to be here at 10:00 today. And yet, rather than going into a courtroom and asking a judge to rule, asking the judge to create some sort of an injunction forcing us to stay here, instead, in a very cowardly way, sends this letter and asks his floor leader, my friend, to stand up on the floor and threaten us all. To threaten us all. To say, better not leave town, don't get in your cars. Well, Governor, I, for one, will be where you can find me. I'll give you all my phone number. Send the State Police for me anytime you want. But I, for one, plan to follow the lead of the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Not because he's the Leader of my Party, not because he's the Leader of the Majority Caucus, but because he's the Leader of this chamber. And on this, all 118 Members of this House stand together. We have a responsibility to protect the integrity of this chamber and we should not and must not let anyone, the Governor, the President of the Senate, or anyone outside of this chamber to instruct this chamber as to what we ought to do to

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

conduct the business of this chamber. And I hope you will all stand with me and together on this issue now and every day for as long as we are here. Let's go back to why we're here in the first place. We're here because we didn't get a budget done. Now, during the process of political name calling that we did and that we continue to do once in a while where Republicans will ja... blame the Majority Party for not getting their act together. That's fine. Make your comments. They've been made. But we're here today because there is no budget. This House passed a budget whether you voted for it or not. Whether you signed some goofy letter afterwards or not disavowing your vote, we passed a budget in this House. One chamber hasn't even addressed the budget, that's the other chamber. We got a Governor who wants to spend three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000) more than we have to spend. And the guy who cites the Constitution in his letter thinks nothing of trying to force us to pass a budget that's three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000) out of balance. Three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000) out of balance. He tried the Gross Receipts Tax. Last I saw, it failed 107-0. Anybody here gonna change their vote on that? I didn't think so. 107-0, Governor. Your plan failed. If you have a plan to provide new revenue to the state, let's have the meeting. We'll be here. We'll sit here in a Committee of the Whole and listen to you talk about new ideas that have not been rejected. a plan to raise three billion (\$3,000,000,000)? Come to floor. We'll convene the meeting... I'm sure you will, Mr. Speaker... and we'll listen and we'll

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

debate it and we'll talk to the witnesses and we'll ask our questions, and maybe we'll get the answers next time when we ask them, and we'll vote it up or down. But at some point... at some point, Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Governor, citizens of Illinois, we need to have a budget that's something like a balanced budget, the Constitution requires that. And say what you will about the needs of Illinois, and we all have our different views about our needs. I would like to spend more money for schools. I would like to find a health care plan. I would do a lot of things, more money for social service agencies, and so would many of you. Today, the money is not there. So to continue to talk about a three billion dollar (\$3,000,000,000) expenditure that we don't have with no way to pay for it, is folly. It's a waste of time, a waste of effort. And I know what the Governor will say. He'll say, 'Oh, Representative Lang, is it a waste of effort of try to help the people of the State of Illinois?' Well, bully for you, Governor. We've heard you say that. We've heard you say it over and over again. But you are the leader of this state. Talk about the Constitution. You are the leader. You've got something to propose, we will be here to listen to your proposal. You wanna tell us how we're gonna raise that three billion dollars (\$3,000,000,000). We can't even engage in the process of how to spend it because we don't have it. You've got a big, bold, creative health care plan, which I'm not sure I'm for, but it doesn't make any difference if I'm for it or all of us are for it if we can't pay for it. So, first comes the revenue then comes the expenditures. You

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

have a tax plan, Governor? Bring it forward. You wanna do some gaming? I might help you with that. Bring it forward. Let's find out what we're willing to do. And Governor, this is the Illinois General Assembly. You served here briefly. If we won't provide you the money, you can't spend it, it's just that simple. During the Committee of the Whole on the Gross Receipts Tax, I asked the Governor a pointed question. Many of you liked the question, I recall. The question was, Governor, you talk about compromise, you talk about negotiation, but whenever you're asked, the only thing you will talk about is your plan, everything else, off the table. And I asked him the question, 'Governor, if everything is off the table how can we compromise?' I don't know what he said. Does anybody recall an answer? And I'm gonna tell you folks on the Minority Party something I'm not supposed to tell you. When the Governor was in our Democratic Caucus I asked him the same question and I got the same garbage for an answer. No answer. I asked him about the health care plan and I said, 'Governor, we're all for a health care plan to do something for the people of the State of Illinois, but we can't afford your plan. So can you scale it back? Can you tell us what you'll agree to so we can try to help you find the money to make sure that Illinoisans that don't have health care can get it?' And I him, 'What about that?' And 'Representative Lang, do you know that there are 1.4 million Illinoisans without health care?' And I said to him, 'Yes, Governor, I know that. But where will you compromise?' And he said, 'Representative Lang,

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

there are 1.4 million Illinoisans without health care?' And I said, 'Governor, where do you want to find the money for this?' He said, 'The Gross Receipts Tax, Representative.' And I said, 'Governor, the Gross Receipts Tax lost 107-0.' And I said, 'Governor, how are you gonna pay for this?' He said, 'Do you know there are 1.4 million Illinoisans without health care?' Ladies and Gentlemen, we cannot put up with this as a chamber. We are going to work together in this chamber, maybe the best we ever have because of what's going on around us. Governor, you've made the worst mistake you could make. You've united 118 people together. I am prepared, as all of us are, all 118, all the staff in this chamber prepared to work together as long as it takes to get the best budget for the State of Illinois we can get. And Governor, if you need to call out the State Police, the dogs, your staff, or anybody else to bring us here, go ahead. Do it. We'll be here. I noted, Mr. Speaker, that the Governor, in another cowardly act, has refused... he's not gonna call the State Police, is he? He's now issued another Proclamation, hasn't he? So rather than doing what someone with guts would do after he threatened us, he's just gonna say, tell ya what, I'll just call ya back in at 2:30 today. This is the man that leads the State of Illinois. I, for one, am fed up with it. I don't care what Party he's in. I am fed up with it. This man must lead. And if he's not gonna lead, let's just trample him, pass a budget, and go home for the summer."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens. Passes. Mr. Hoffman."

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

Hoffman: "Well, I think it's all coming together. Don't you think? Just a matter of time. I just would like to address a couple... a couple of issues my good friend and colleague from Danville. Here's the problem. I agree with ya. Does it make a difference if it's 10 or it's 2? You're right. Does it really make a difference? My point is this. If we allow the constitutional authority of the Governor, whether it's this Governor or whether it was Governor Thompson or whether it's gonna maybe Governor Cross or some other Governor in the future. Right? If we were to allow that constitutional authority to be... and the judicial precedent and the statutory authority, as I see it, to be changed even this small amount, then who's going to say that some other leader some day won't be able to say, well, we're not gonna meet today. We're gonna meet tomorrow. Or we're not gonna meet this week in your called Special Session, we're gonna meet the next week. Or we're not gonna meet this year, we're gonna meet the next year. So my point is, I believe to not acknowledge the constitutional right of a Governor, any Governor, the statutory right of a Governor, any Governor, is a very difficult path, a treacherous path that I don't think we wanna walk. With regard to my friend from... Lou Lang. Representative Lang. It wasn't meant... I'm not trying to threaten anybody. Believe me. I'm trying to tell ya, for our families' sake, for everybody's families' sake, let's make plans. It looks like we're going to be here. That's all I was trying to do. I wanna be home, too. I'm not gonna be able to go home. That was... that statement was made not as a threat, but to give you some kind options

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

so that you can plan. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the time."

Speaker Madigan: "Jerry Mitchell."

Mitchell, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I've... I've stood with you and I've argued with you over many different issues, but quite frankly, I know the anguish that... that you're feeling right now. And we all are. As I was leaving just for a minute, no intention of jumping in my car and racing out of the city as the Governor's staff thought I was going to, I was served with a new Proclamation and I'll cut right to the chase. It's says: THEREFORE, pursuant to Article IV, Section 5(b) of the Illinois Constitution of 1970, I hereby call and convene the 95th General Assembly in a Special Session to commence on July 7, 2007, at 2:30 p.m., to consider any legislation, new or pending, which will address the budget of the Department of Health Care and Family Services for the Child Support Administrative Fund for Fiscal Year 2008. Now, I guess my question is are we going to adjourn and then just hang around 'til 2:30 or will this be handled in a different way? And a... ya know, does this mean there's two (2) per diems for today? I... I don't know. I'm getting really confused. And... and one other point... and Lou, I respect you a hundred percent and what you said is absolutely true. But when we ask people to change their vote on something like this, don't look at the Republicans. Look at the Democrats. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Starting at the end and coming forward, there will be one per diem. And let me defer answering the first

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

- part of the question for just a bit. There's no one seeking recognition and so we can proceed to convene the Special Session. And I forget where we were. All right. So, the Clerk shall read the Proclamation."
- Clerk Mahoney: "WHEREAS, Article VIII (SIC-XIII), Section 5 of the Illinois Constitution of 1970 requires the State to provide pension benefits to members of State-sponsored retirement systems; and
- WHEREAS, the State of Illinois supports a retirement plan on behalf of State employees; and
- WHEREAS, State employees, retirees and their families rely on the security provided by pension benefits to meet their needs, including food, housing and health care after retirement; and
- WHEREAS, it is the State Employees' Retirement System's (SERS) mission to provide an orderly means whereby aged or disabled employees may be retired from active service, without prejudice or hardship, and to enable the employees to accumulate reserves for themselves and their dependents for old age, disability, death and termination of employment, thus effecting economy and efficiency in the administration of the State Government; and
- WHEREAS, pensions managed and administered by SERS are underfunded, and the General Assembly has yet to pass a Fiscal Year 2008 budget or any measures addressing such underfunding;
- THEREFORE, pursuant to Article IV, Section 5, Subsection (b) of the Illinois Constitution of 1970, I hereby call and convene the 95th General Assembly in a special session to

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

commence on July 7, 2007, at 2:00 p.m., to consider any legislation, new or pending, which will address the funding of the State of Illinois Retirement System Illinois, citing Governor Rod R. Blagojevich."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I believe there were some Resolutions that have been introduced."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, have Resolutions been introduced?"

Clerk Mahoney: "House Special... House Special Session Resolu...

Third Special Session Resolution #1 and House Third Special

Session Resolution #2 have been introduced."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Then thank you, Speaker. I move for the immediate consideration and suspension of applicable House Rules so that we may adopt Third Special Session House Resolutions 1 and 2."

Speaker Madigan: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Lady's Motion is adopted. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. At the… I would ask the Clerk please to read Third Special Session House Resolutions 1 and 2."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Mahoney: "House Third Special Resolution #1. RESOLVED, by the Rules of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-Fifth General Assembly be adopted as the Rules of this Third Special Session, so far as the same may be applicable, and the Committees of the House of Representatives of the Ninety-Fifth General Assembly, shall

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

constitute the Committees of the House during this Third Special Session. Third Special Session House Resolution #2.

RESOLVED, that the Clerk inform the Senate that a majority of the House has assembled, pursuant to the Proclamation of the Governor, convening a Third Special Session of the General Assembly, and are now ready for the transaction of business."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "I move the adoption of the two (2) Resolutions."

Speaker Madigan: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, Rules Report. Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, does the staff have to stay here the remainder of the day as well?"

Speaker Madigan: "Speaking for our staff, when we're in Session, they're in the building. Mr. Bill Mitchell."

Mitchell, B.: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege."

Speaker Madigan: "State your point."

Mitchell, B.: "Looks like people are gonna be staying in Springfield this week and I know my colleague, Mr. Poe, announced yesterday some activities in the City of Springfield. Just outside of Springfield, to the east, is Mechanicsburg which is celebrating its 175th birthday. Now, I missed the parade this morning to be here to do the work of the people. They're having a festival all weekend. Please feel free to drive over to Mechanicsburg, they'd love to have ya."

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair. And, ya know, I do a lot of joking around and everything like that on this floor at times, and lightheartedness, well this has gone to the point that it's... it's totally ridiculous. So much to the point, I have a few questions. And I know you were here when the Constitution was put together and that you served on Con/Con. Were there Articles or were their parts of the Constitution that were put in place that would deal with impeachment of the Governor? I'm not joking on this. I'm dead serious. What does our Constitution say about that? I'm not aware."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost, let the parliamentarian respond. Mr. Ellis."

Parliamentarian Ellis: "Representative Bost, in response to your inquiry, on behalf of the Speaker, I will not purport to be an expert on this regard, but the Legislative Article of the Illinois Constitution has a provision, it is Section 14 of Article IV of the Illinois Constitution, deals with impeachment. It gives the House of Representatives the sole power to conduct legislative investigations, to determine the existence of cause for impeachment, and to a... and by the vote of a majority of the members elected, to impeach executive and judicial officers."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Bost."

Bost: "To that being said, I don't say this lightly. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're trying to do the work of the people and the chief executive officer who has been elected by the voters of the State of Illinois refuses to guit playing

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

games and do what is right. He wants us here, he keeps saying he wants us here, and he plays these games on what time we're going to do it and when we're going to do it. But yet, once again, where is he? Why doesn't he talk with us? I do not believe that he is fulfilling his obligations in his job. I believe that maybe we ought to look into what it will take and if there are any violations and do that check to see if he is to the point that impeachment proceedings could start. I don't say it lightly. I'm not joking. I'm dead serious and I believe that this Body should take it up."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Are we going to entertain questions on the topic of the day? Or how are we going to..."

Speaker Madigan: "That'd be my plan that we're now in the Special Session called by the Governor and this Special Session relates to the SERS Pension System."

Mulligan: "All right. I..."

Speaker Madigan: "And so we're prepared to... to consider the topic of that Special Session. Let me advise the Members that, pursuant to our desire to do our work this morning, we advised the executive director of the SERS system yesterday that we wanted him to join us at 10:00 and be prepared to testify to the topics set out in the Governor's Proclamation. That gentleman has advised us that the chair of his board, a gentleman named Mr. Mazzotti, has advised him that he should not appear before the House to testify until he has had an opportunity to consult with Mr. Mazzotti and Mr. Mazzotti would not be available until 2

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

p.m. this afternoon. So, in terms of adequately responding to the Proclamation, which talked about the condition of the SER System, our thought was, well, let's have the executive director here to talk about it. And I've just told you he won't be available until 2:00 this afternoon."

Mulligan: "Oh. Well, you know, I must apologize to the Body. My seatmate has wonderful jelly beans out here and even though I sit here and only eat one at a time, by 2:00, 3:00, 5:00, I'm a little hyperactive and so I tend to say things that maybe I wouldn't say were... were he could come earlier. But in past negotiations that you and I have participated in with the Governor's staff, particularly on Saturdays, it's always been our principle to start as early as possible so that we respect our respective staffs who have families to go home at a reasonable hour. I don't know why he would've thought that our general mode of operation would change, because I think we all have staff that works very hard, many of them have young children, it's a holiday week, and many of them either are gone and have other people covering for them or were... unfortunately, gave up their vacation time. So, I don't understand really why the Governor did not assume that we would generally do the operations that we normally do and respect our staff to do them as early as possible, get it over with so that they could spend the rest of the day with their families, and for the same tomorrow. But for that... because he did that and because there's this whole big question, I really wonder why would we be talking about the employees' system without the adequate discussion and the people here to present whatever

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

we may not have talked about before. Over the year, many of us have met since the beginning of Session and discussed pension and the Governor's plans and what it would do to the pension system. I think many of us have been available to meet with them whenever they would like us to. That has not happened. I think we are all duly worried about the employee's pension system. This Governor has negotiated with various bodies, unions, and whatever. He has increased the pay rate, which increases the pensions. He's done any number of things and has not shown any particular regard for the pensions. But by calling at such a time when some of us may feel that we would prefer to be with families or do other things, he will then say that we were not worried about them. But I think the true case of the matter is, he has not been here in Springfield for most of the Session. We've been willing and able to talk. We have introduced Bills. Any Bill that I have put out there that would have legislative oversight, which has passed to the House, he has stalled in the Senate. So, obviously he doesn't want legislative input. What he wants is to beat us up a little more. And if I have another jelly bean or two, I will go into that. But I do think that perhaps if we're willing to talk at any point of the day about the issues that he's brought up, that he should try to accommodate us also. Negotiate and compromise seem to be two words that he doesn't understand. And I think if you expend the political capital that you have with the Members, you certainly can't be then trusted to worry about the capital that we expend on pensions. So, the two do not coincide. I think in the

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

last two weeks he seems to have expended his political capital and his ability to work with Members to some degree. I don't understand where that is, but certainly if you have that kind of temperament how do we then do something about pension systems? And you certainly can't do them if you don't raise revenue. Revenue is raised by a good political climate for working, and business, and labor all together. He seems to not understand that. So, I'm not sure how we can ask questions of witnesses he forbids to be here at a time that would be convenient for everyone, including staff. He's insulting my Leader. He's insulting you. We duly elected you to be our representative, so in insulting our Leaders he insults us. I don't find that to be a good way for us to come together on any conclusion. Personally, I think we should address the pension system in a reasonable manner, that puts a reasonable amount of money into it and move forward. His... I will go one step further into what Representative Lang said in their discussion about health care. We met with his people a number of weeks ago on health care and tried to say he could probably break it down into five (5) parts and we would be willing to talk about reasonable parts of it. They never came back to us and said they would only discuss the whole. Now quite frankly, when I go door-to-door in my district and I talk to Republicans and Democrats, I have never heard a Democrat say to me, 'Tax me more and squander my money.' You know, I mean, it's pretty much, whether you're a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent, someone at the door usually says to me, 'My property taxes are too high, but can my...

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

can you know my alderman? Can he fix my curb?' And they don't put the two together and they certainly don't say, 'Raise my taxes and squander my money.' They want services and they don't want us to raise taxes, and it then becomes our problem to figure out how to handle that. And when you have a Governor that won't figure it out on a reasonable manner it puts our job in jeopardy and it makes it harder for us. Unfortunately, his millions of dollars in campaign funds allow him to have a bully pulpit where he goes on television and he is the Governor so the press interviews him first and then we are the peons that aren't doing what he wants. I don't think an answer of, 'This is how many people don't have health care.' I think answers that say, 'I'm willing to negotiate. I'm willing to figure out an answer.' I understand the pension system may be a problem. I'm a lot older than he is. I probably won't be in the General Assembly when there's a crisis on pensions. But I do know that state employees, teachers, are all aware of the fact that if future General Assemblies decide that they do not want... they do not want to fulfill the tax requirements it would be because the state's going to go bankrupt over pensions. What they are libel to do is put an Amendment on the ballot that says, 'Should the State of Illinois remove the constitutional requirement that obligates us to pay pensions?' And for the poor people out there whose companies have taken advantage of them and ruined their pensions, I guess my feeling is the public will say, 'Who gives a rat's ass whether we get funded to our pensions?' And that will remove the obligation of the

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

General Assembly to raise the income tax to cover the pensions. Now, the state's employees know that. I had another jelly bean, I just threw that out there to wake everybody up. You know, so in future times people won't have their pensions paid because, basically, what will happen is they will take that out of the general assumption that we have to cover it. And so, for the younger people that are starting, we will have that problem. All right... I think I'll bring that to a close. If we stall around enough it will be 2:30 and then we will have... we will oblige him, and it is not my intention to be here at 2:30 and oblige him."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would simply urge the Chair with your subpoena power to subpoena Mr. Mazzotti when his minion arrives because I have some questions I'd like to ask Mr. Mazzotti about the suggestion that was made to him that his person not come here this morning. I have some personal questions I'd like to ask him on the record of this House of Representatives. So, if you would subpoena him to compel his appearance, I would appreciate it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Eddy."

Eddy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Parliamentarian, as well. And I don't wanna put him on the spot; however, this pertains to a topic that Representative Bost has brought up. My question has to do with Article IV, Section 5(b), which clearly states that the Governor may convene the General Assembly or Senate in Special Session by Proclamation stating the purpose of the Session. And we

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

know the purpose, it's in the Proclamation. But it goes on to say, 'Only business encompassed by such purpose, together with any impeachment.' So the fact of the matter is that Representative Bost's topic is appropriate to a Special Session. That's my question."

Speaker Madigan: "The answer is 'yes'."

Eddy: "Thank you. So the Governor would be well served to listen carefully. His Special Session Proclamation, includes a specific purpose for which he compels witnesses not to show up and testify, also can be used for the purpose of impeachment. He would be well understand that that's what the Constitution says. before he waives the Constitution in our face over what time we meet, he might actually read it and understand the deeper implications of the Constitution with regards to issues of seriousness and very serious issues like removing someone who has been duly elected by the people. This is not said lightly. We're talking about the potential of using these Sessions to remove the executive officer of the State of Illinois for malfeasance of office. And I think he'd be well served to actually read the Constitution once or twice, maybe while he's jogging, perhaps even now."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Beaubien."

Beaubien: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to address the pension issue. I have said many time on this floor, as a Member of the Governor's Pension Commission that issued a report in September of 2005, that there essentially were no pension reforms that were passed a couple of years ago. That report, which I urge you all to read, contained nine (9)

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

separate recommendations, some of which would significant effect on the pension liability. We're talking only about new employees, and I wanna emphasize that, only new employees age 65 for retirement. That would effect the obligations of the system in the future. It's just like a 2 percent COLA versus a 3 percent would've helped. When the Governor made his presentation to the General Assembly he had seven (7) potential provisions in his speech. We ended up with two (2), took one away the following year, we ended up with absolutely no pension reform. I think it's irresponsible on the behalf of this General Assembly to have any discussion of pensions, sales of assets for pensions, until we first and foremost address the necessity of pension reform. Corporations have done it, other states have done it, municipalities have done it. I think... believe the RTA... or CT... the CTA just did it. They made serious reforms. We should not be talking about anything other than reform. And let me give you a couple of ideas other than the ones presented. Actually, they were in the alternative section. Possibility of taxing pensions over fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) or some number. Most states do. I think almost all states do. How about lowering the expectation from 90 percent to 85 percent? What would the... affect would that have? We should look into these questions. There's no magic number to 90. Maybe we need to lower the expectations just a little bit. If you look at the Bill that was presented, what he was intending to do was what he's being doing for several years. If we pass the pension bond or the other... sale of the lottery, he was gonna then remove sixty

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

million dollar... six hundred million dollar (\$600,000,000) pension deposit this year. It's only intention as a way of funding the pensions upfront and taking the money like he's done before. When we did the pens... the initial pension bond issuance, we took 2.5 billion dollars (\$2,500,000,000) of that money and used it for payments over a 2-year period. In retrospect, all of the money should've gone in and we should've paid the 2.5 billion dollars (\$2,500,000,000) in pension payments those years. The Bill we... Senate Bill 27 took out 2.3 billion dollars (\$2,300,000,000) over 2 years and you ramp it up to where it's suppose to be in a couple of years, that's a 3.5 million dollar (\$3,500,000) raid. Now, the Governor is saying to the people, we have a pension problem. In his 5 to 6 years here... before he's here 6 years, he will have raided the pension system of 6 billion dollars (\$6,000,000,000). What a surprise. A couple of other things, I've been partially involved in the budget discussions and I can say to this date, to every Member of this General Assembly, to my knowledge to this date today there has been no serious discussion. None from the Governor's Office on having a budget that can pass the General Assembly and be signed by the government. That's not what they're talking about and I find that disgusting. My suggestion is that we rally as a team, it's been suggested here before, rally as a team, get the 71 votes necessary, pass a budget, and send it out of here. That's the only way we're ever gonna be able to get home. This individual is just beyond belief. People that've been around here for many years that we've had discussions with

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

under prior administrations, this is the most bizarre Governor, the most bizarre Session in the history of the State of Illinois. And shame on us if we don't do something to move this whole process forward. And I think we're gonna have to do it jointly, together as a team. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I think the remarks by my colleague and seatmate, Representative Beaubien, are certainly on target and is what we need to be discussing. And he is certainly more up to date on those issues than I. Let... let me, if I might, Mr. Speaker ... and I'm not disagreeing with my colleagues. I... I have no better friends in the world than Representative Bost Representative Eddy. But let's... let's not today... let's... let's stop the rhetoric on impeachment. Okay? We don't need to go down that road. Washington's tried that. Then the Republicans... while I think that was a rather tawdry time in our history, the Republicans tried that in Washington. It didn't work. It didn't help the country. There are Democrats today calling for the impeachment of President Bush. I don't think that will bear any fruit and it doesn't add to the general tenor of discussion that needs to be taking place in Washington. And I don't think it would add anything to the tenor of discussion that needs to take place here. If there are those of you who want to pursue that and seek out the staff legal counsel and prepare... carefully prepare your rationale and reason, sobeit. But I don't think we need to bring up the potential impeachment

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

of the Governor on this House Floor. I don't think we are prepared nor should we go down that road at this time. I think what we need to do today is to discuss the impending difficulty that our pension systems are facing. It's too bad. And I certainly agree with Representative Lang and the chamber does have subpoena power. We have used it in the past and I think it's time we use it again. I'd like to know the reasons and the rationale as to why the acting director of SERS was told he could not testify and be here until 2:00. Again, I go back to the elementary school yard arguments, you know, I'm gonna hold my breath until I turn blue. I'd like to know why he was told he couldn't be here, because we need to know answers to certain questions. Some of the annuitants who live in my district are telling me that they are being told by people on the inside who know... you know how this goes. And I always ask them, 'Well, who told you this?' 'Well, my sister-in-law used to date somebody who used to date somebody who was the secretary to the director of SERS many years ago.' I mean, you take some of these things you're told with a grain of salt. But they come into my office when I'm back home and they want... they say that we are selling assets in order to make current payments. Don't know if we are or not. If we are, is that a common practice? Should we be doing that? And if we are, why are, why are we doing so? I think the Majority Leader yesterday made a good point. If you mortgage your future in order to pay this week's grocery bill or, God forbid, you're selling off part of your future to make current payments, then something may be more seriously wrong than

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

many of us have been led to believe. But I can't ask an empty chair to answer that question. I'd like to know what the funded ratio is to the projected payout and debt over the next 5 years, the next 10 years, the next 15 years. One of the things that I've often become very frustrated about in this... in this Body, and I'm very frustrated with what we've heard since the budget message in March, we don't seem to plan more than 1 year ahead. Oh, trust me. We'll get through this. We don't have the money, but don't worry about it. Well, what are the costs for some of these programs in the... in the out years? What does it cost 2 years from now, 4 years from now, 8 years from now? What... what actual condition are the pensions in? I don't know that the sky is falling and I don't think Chicken Little is an expert on the pension system. Yes, I think we are headed towards problems. I don't know if that problem will become insurmountable in Fiscal '08, Fiscal '10, Fiscal '15. I don't... I don't know. We get conflicting answers. So it's really frustrating for me to look at empty chairs because there are many SERS annuitants who live in my district and there are current state workers who live in my district, and they want to know what... what they can count on. They want to know what the actual fiscal health is of the pension system. Now, we've heard all kinds of conflicting testimony over the years. I... I think that it's justice. I was looking through this form that was on our desk and perhaps it is justice that the General Assembly Retirement System appears to be the worst funded system of all. So, perhaps one can draw comfort from that. But as I approach

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

retirement age, I'm not sure that I find comfort in that. But if we could, again, just simply lower the rhetoric, get people to show up, and answer real questions from real people so that we can go back and tell the people we represent what the fiscal health is of their system. When we get into a system... when do we get into the possibility that current annuity... annuitant payments are having to be used to pay retirement benefits. You know, it's kind of like the Social Security issue in Washington, D.C., which has suddenly become the third rail of national politics. Nobody wants to discuss the actual fiscal health of Social Security. If you want to privatize a portion, oh, that's... you know, that's not good. Some say that critical mass will be here in 10 years, some say it will be in 20, some say it will be in 50, and we have the same situation with the pension system. And I think it is a sad day for the process when we have questions we need answered and all we are looking at is empty chairs and cannot get answers and people are told by the Executive Branch to ignore the Legislative Branch and not show up until 2:00 or 2:30 or whatever time it may be. That doesn't add much to the process. And I... I would also like to bring up one point. And I wish, Mr. Speaker, you could have Mr. Ellis look into this. We're now being told that Special Sessions will be called for next week, not to deal with the budget, which is where the immediate crisis and pressure point is, but to deal with substantive legislation. If the rumor mill is anywhere near accurate, and around here you can find any rumor you want, but supposedly next Tuesday or Wednesday we

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

will be called back to Special Session to deal with gun legislation. Now, those kinds of issues can and have been addressed in regular Session, and some have passed and some have failed. But I... I would ask the Speaker and the parliamentarian... and I'm sure the Governor has the power to call us into Special Session for whatever reason he wants. But my advice and my hope is that we would use the Special Session powers of the Governor to deal with matters of the budget, because we could be here forever discussing substantive legislation if, in fact, that's what we start doing. And most of those have already had a hearing and they can certainly be brought up in the 2008 Session. But the questions that I have on the handout we were given, there's nobody here to answer them. I go back home, I will have a ton of voice mail messages, dozens of letters, and I... how am I going to answer them? I don't have ... I don't have the answers. And there's nobody here to give me the answers. This is a foolish, childish, and nonproductive way to do the work that we were elected to do. And I'm not threatening anybody and I'm not trying to be a hardnosed. I'm not sticking around here all afternoon. I have a yard to mow. I have things to do at home. I got a call last night from my dog and my dog has a right to know why I'm not there for her nightly 8:00 walk. And I can tell ya, the dog was not happy. Listen, if you didn't get your nightly walk to go out and do what you're supposed to you'd be howling too. Furthermore, I just talked to my wife. Wanted to know if I'd be home for lunch, I said it doesn't look like it. Wanted to know if I'd be home for dinner, I said I

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

don't know. And she said, 'You know, perhaps it's time for the spouses to come over and meet with the Governor.' That may be the best idea I've heard yet. And there's one other question, while I'm just thinking about things. I've served under four (4) Governors and, you know, you used to be able to go down in the Governor's Office, go through the door, and ask one of the secretaries or legislative assistants or administrative assistants if you could have an appointment with the Governor that day and what about and tell them. And I often met with Jim Thompson, Governor Thompson. often met with Governor Edgar. I often met with Governor Ryan. not had much success in meeting with Blagojevich. But the last time I went down there, there are these barriers. One has a black barrier like you'd see at Disneyland, which may be appropriate, I don't know. And if you walk another 10 feet there's a red... a red barrier. And I don't know whether the red means there could be landmines beyond that, but I felt like I was being watched and that I had no right to go beyond the red barrier. And God forbid, I would open the door to my Governor... my Governor's Office and see if I could make an appointment. When did that happen? Why have those things changed? Governor, why don't you show up and tell us all these things and why don't you allow people to come and testify? So I'm going to copy this and I'm going to send it out to all of my SERS annuitants and maybe they can figure it out, but I know it will generate questions that I can't answer. And I find that very frustrating that I'm here today not able to talk to anybody about the pension systems. I'm getting some from

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

help from staff. Oh, that's why we have staff. She pointed out that this entire document is for the fiscal year that ended June 30, 2006. It isn't even current information. Thank you, Mr. Blair. Thank you for not being here. Thank you for not answering our questions. Thank you for being a good employee and doing what you're told. But you know something, Mr. Blair? I'm a student of history. Don't ever put yourself in the position of those who were on trial at Nuremberg in the 1946, '47, and '48 where the only excuse you have for doing something is, 'I was only following orders.' It's time for some of these people to do what's right rather than say, 'I don't know. I was only following orders.' Enough is enough."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Sacia."

Sacia: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, Representative Hoffman asked a very timely question. He asked to offer an alternative. The Governor has proposed the sale of the lottery which we defeated yesterday with a vote of 6 'yes' votes and 78 'no' votes. I would offer as a very serious alternative, offer it for sale for what it's worth. I suggest offering the lottery for sale for its indebtedness of the pension plan of forty-one billion dollars (\$41,000,000,000). And businessman, Ladies as Gentlemen, as a businessman and referring to Representative Lang said yesterday, which I also think was very timely, the lottery is generating six hundred and thirty million dollars (\$630,000,000) a year in clear profit and being administered by a very inefficient organization. Offer it for sale for forty-one billion

1st Legislative Day

7/7/2007

dollars (\$41,000,000,000), ten billion (10,000,000,000) down, the balance over 10 years at 8 percent interest. I'll be anybody the tallest beer in Springfield that it will sell. I betcha Mr. Lang will vote for that. I'll vote for that. I think it's a viable alternative and, Representative Hoffman, I'd ask you to take that suggestion to the Governor. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, we're prepared to adjourn this Special Session until tomorrow at 5:00. For that purpose, the Chair recognizes Representative Currie who moves that the House stand adjourned until 5 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. Those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it."